

Reported as of 11/4/05

Water Supply & Reuse

Reporting Unit:
City of San Jose

Year:
2001

Water Supply Source Information

Supply Source Name	Quantity (AF) Supplied	Supply Type
SCVWD	14629	Imported
Hetch-Hetchy	5411	Imported
Wells	634	Groundwater
SBWR	957	Recycled

Total AF: 21631

Reported as of 11/4/05

Accounts & Water Use

Reporting Unit Name:
City of San Jose

Submitted to
CUWCC
01/15/2003

Year:
2001

A. Service Area Population Information:

1. Total service area population 96500

B. Number of Accounts and Water Deliveries (AF)

Type	Metered		Unmetered	
	No. of Accounts	Water Deliveries (AF)	No. of Accounts	Water Deliveries (AF)
1. Single-Family	20724	9777	0	0
2. Multi-Family	947	2139	0	0
3. Commercial	380	1391	0	0
4. Industrial	272	2527	0	0
5. Institutional	56	507	0	0
6. Dedicated Irrigation	740	4251	0	0
7. Recycled Water	69	957	0	0
8. Other	98	282	0	0
9. Unaccounted	NA	0	NA	0
Total	23286	21831	0	0
	Metered		Unmetered	

Reported as of 11/4/05

Reported as of 11/4/05

BMP 01: Water Survey Programs for Single-Family and Multi-Family Residential Customers

Reporting Unit:

BMP Form Status:

Year:

City of San Jose**100% Complete****2001**

A. Implementation

- | | |
|--|------------|
| 1. Based on your signed MOU date, 03/24/1995, your Agency STRATEGY DUE DATE is: | 03/23/1997 |
| 2. Has your agency developed and implemented a targeting/marketing strategy for SINGLE-FAMILY residential water use surveys? | yes |
| a. If YES, when was it implemented? | 7/1/1998 |
| 3. Has your agency developed and implemented a targeting/marketing strategy for MULTI-FAMILY residential water use surveys? | yes |
| a. If YES, when was it implemented? | 7/1/2000 |

B. Water Survey Data

Survey Counts:	Single Family Accounts	Multi-Family Units
1. Number of surveys offered:	1600	1600
2. Number of surveys completed:	423	199

Indoor Survey:

- | | | |
|---|-----|-----|
| 3. Check for leaks, including toilets, faucets and meter checks | yes | yes |
| 4. Check showerhead flow rates, aerator flow rates, and offer to replace or recommend replacement, if necessary | yes | yes |
| 5. Check toilet flow rates and offer to install or recommend installation of displacement device or direct customer to ULFT replacement program, as necessary; replace leaking toilet flapper, as necessary | yes | yes |

Outdoor Survey:

- | | | |
|--|----------------|-----|
| 6. Check irrigation system and timers | yes | yes |
| 7. Review or develop customer irrigation schedule | yes | yes |
| 8. Measure landscaped area (Recommended but not required for surveys) | no | no |
| 9. Measure total irrigable area (Recommended but not required for surveys) | no | no |
| 10. Which measurement method is typically used (Recommended but not required for surveys) | Measuring Tape | |
| 11. Were customers provided with information packets that included evaluation results and water savings recommendations? | yes | yes |

12. Have the number of surveys offered and completed, survey results, and survey costs been tracked?

yesyes

a. If yes, in what form are surveys tracked?

database

b. Describe how your agency tracks this information.

The residential water survey program discussed here is administered by the Santa Clara Valley Water District (SCVWD). The SCVWD tracks information in a Microsoft Access database.

C. Water Survey Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	0	3518
2. Actual Expenditures	0	

D. "At Least As Effective As"

1. Is your AGENCY implementing an "at least as effective as" variant of this BMP?

No

a. If YES, please explain in detail how your implementation of this BMP differs from Exhibit 1 and why you consider it to be "at least as effective as."

E. Comments

The City of San Jose financially supports the home water use survey program conducted by the SCVWD. The expenditure figures above represent the SJMWS's 7% portion of the City's trib-wide (San Jose, Santa Clara, Milpitas, Saratoga, Monte Sereno, Los Gatos, Campbell, Cupertino and Saratoga) program. The exact breakdown of the City's contribution is not tracked separately for each of the tributary water retailers.

Reported as of 11/4/05

BMP 02: Residential Plumbing Retrofit

Reporting Unit:

BMP Form Status:

Year:

City of San Jose**100% Complete****2001****A. Implementation**

1. Is there an enforceable ordinance in effect in your service area requiring replacement of high-flow showerheads and other water use fixtures with their low-flow counterparts? no

a. If YES, list local jurisdictions in your service area and code or ordinance in each:

2. Has your agency satisfied the 75% saturation requirement for single-family housing units? no

3. Estimated percent of single-family households with low-flow showerheads: 0%

4. Has your agency satisfied the 75% saturation requirement for multi-family housing units? no

5. Estimated percent of multi-family households with low-flow showerheads: 0%

6. If YES to 2 OR 4 above, please describe how saturation was determined, including the dates and results of any survey research.

B. Low-Flow Device Distribution Information

1. Has your agency developed a targeting/ marketing strategy for distributing low-flow devices? no

a. If YES, when did your agency begin implementing this strategy?

b. Describe your targeting/ marketing strategy.

Low-Flow Devices Distributed/ Installed	SF Accounts	MF Units
2. Number of low-flow showerheads distributed:	72	0
3. Number of toilet-displacement devices distributed:	0	0
4. Number of toilet flappers distributed:	0	0
5. Number of faucet aerators distributed:	400	0
6. Does your agency track the distribution and cost of low-flow devices?		no
a. If YES, in what format are low-flow devices tracked?		
b. If yes, describe your tracking and distribution system :		

C. Low-Flow Device Distribution Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	0	0

2. Actual Expenditures

0

D. "At Least As Effective As"

1. Is your AGENCY implementing an "at least as effective as" variant of this BMP? No

a. If YES, please explain in detail how your implementation of this BMP differs from Exhibit 1 and why you consider it to be "at least as effective as."

E. Comments

This program is a collaboration between the City of San Jose Water Efficiency Program and the Santa Clara Valley Water District. These devices have been given out free at community events, thus data is not available on the level of saturation.

Reported as of 11/4/05

BMP 03: System Water Audits, Leak Detection and Repair

Reporting Unit:
City of San Jose

BMP Form Status:
100% Complete

Year:
2001

A. Implementation

1. Has your agency completed a pre-screening system audit for this reporting year? yes
2. If YES, enter the values (AF/Year) used to calculate verifiable use as a percent of total production:
 - a. Determine metered sales (AF) 21934
 - b. Determine other system verifiable uses (AF) 0
 - c. Determine total supply into the system (AF) 22089
 - d. Using the numbers above, if (Metered Sales + Other Verifiable Uses) / Total Supply is < 0.9 then a full-scale system audit is required. 0.99
3. Does your agency keep necessary data on file to verify the values used to calculate verifiable uses as a percent of total production? yes
4. Did your agency complete a full-scale audit during this report year? no
5. Does your agency maintain in-house records of audit results or the completed AWWA audit worksheets for the completed audit? yes
6. Does your agency operate a system leak detection program? yes
 - a. If yes, describe the leak detection program:

Will perform formal leak detection program if audit shows water loss greater than 5%

B. Survey Data

1. Total number of miles of distribution system line. 311
2. Number of miles of distribution system line surveyed. 0

C. System Audit / Leak Detection Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	0	0
2. Actual Expenditures	0	

D. "At Least As Effective As"

1. Is your AGENCY implementing an "at least as effective as" variant of this BMP? No
 - a. If YES, please explain in detail how your implementation of this BMP differs from Exhibit 1 and why you consider it to be "at least as effective as."

E. Comments

Reported as of 11/4/05

BMP 04: Metering with Commodity Rates for all New Connections and Retrofit of Existing

Reporting Unit:

BMP Form Status:

Year:

City of San Jose**100% Complete****2001**

A. Implementation

- | | |
|---|-----|
| 1. Does your agency require meters for all new connections and bill by volume-of-use? | yes |
| 2. Does your agency have a program for retrofitting existing unmetered connections and bill by volume-of-use? | no |
| a. If YES, when was the plan to retrofit and bill by volume-of-use existing unmetered connections completed? | |
| b. Describe the program: | |
| 3. Number of previously unmetered accounts fitted with meters during report year. | 0 |

B. Feasibility Study

- | | |
|--|----|
| 1. Has your agency conducted a feasibility study to assess the merits of a program to provide incentives to switch mixed-use accounts to dedicated landscape meters? | no |
| a. If YES, when was the feasibility study conducted?
(mm/dd/yy) | |
| b. Describe the feasibility study: | |
| 2. Number of CII accounts with mixed-use meters. | 0 |
| 3. Number of CII accounts with mixed-use meters retrofitted with dedicated irrigation meters during reporting period. | 0 |

C. Meter Retrofit Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	0	0
2. Actual Expenditures	0	

D. "At Least As Effective As"

- | | |
|--|----|
| 1. Is your AGENCY implementing an "at least as effective as" variant of this BMP? | No |
| a. If YES, please explain in detail how your implementation of this BMP differs from Exhibit 1 and why you consider it to be "at least as effective as." | |

E. Comments

Reported as of 11/4/05

BMP 05: Large Landscape Conservation Programs and Incentives

Reporting Unit:

City of San Jose

BMP Form Status:

100% Complete

Year:

2001

A. Water Use Budgets

- | | |
|--|-----|
| 1. Number of Dedicated Irrigation Meter Accounts: | 740 |
| 2. Number of Dedicated Irrigation Meter Accounts with Water Budgets: | 0 |
| 3. Budgeted Use for Irrigation Meter Accounts with Water Budgets (AF): | 0 |
| 4. Actual Use for Irrigation Meter Accounts with Water Budgets (AF): | 0 |
| 5. Does your agency provide water use notices to accounts with budgets each billing cycle? | no |

B. Landscape Surveys

- | | |
|---|-----------|
| 1. Has your agency developed a marketing / targeting strategy for landscape surveys? | yes |
| a. If YES, when did your agency begin implementing this strategy? | 10/1/1994 |
| b. Description of marketing / targeting strategy: | |
| The landscape survey program discussed here is administered by the Santa Clara Valley Water District for its retailers. | |
| 2. Number of Surveys Offered. | 0 |
| 3. Number of Surveys Completed. | 0 |
| 4. Indicate which of the following Landscape Elements are part of your survey: | |
| a. Irrigation System Check | yes |
| b. Distribution Uniformity Analysis | yes |
| c. Review / Develop Irrigation Schedules | yes |
| d. Measure Landscape Area | yes |
| e. Measure Total Irrigable Area | yes |
| f. Provide Customer Report / Information | yes |
| 5. Do you track survey offers and results? | yes |
| 6. Does your agency provide follow-up surveys for previously completed surveys? | no |
| a. If YES, describe below: | |

C. Other BMP 5 Actions

- | | |
|---|----|
| 1. An agency can provide mixed-use accounts with ETo-based landscape budgets in lieu of a large landscape survey program. Does your agency provide mixed-use accounts with landscape budgets? | no |
|---|----|

2. Number of CII mixed-use accounts with landscape budgets. 0
3. Do you offer landscape irrigation training? yes
4. Does your agency offer financial incentives to improve landscape water use efficiency? no

Type of Financial Incentive:

Budget (Dollars/ Year)	Number Awarded to Customers	Total Amount Awarded
------------------------------	--------------------------------------	----------------------------

- a. Rebates
- b. Loans
- c. Grants

5. Do you provide landscape water use efficiency information to new customers and customers changing services? No

a. If YES, describe below:

6. Do you have irrigated landscaping at your facilities? yes
- a. If yes, is it water-efficient? yes
 - b. If yes, does it have dedicated irrigation metering? yes
7. Do you provide customer notices at the start of the irrigation season? yes
8. Do you provide customer notices at the end of the irrigation season? yes

D. Landscape Conservation Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
--	-----------	-----------

- | | | |
|--------------------------|---|---|
| 1. Budgeted Expenditures | 0 | 0 |
| 2. Actual Expenditures | 0 | |

E. "At Least As Effective As"

1. Is your AGENCY implementing an "at least as effective as" variant of this BMP? No
- a. If YES, please explain in detail how your implementation of this BMP differs from Exhibit 1 and why you consider it to be "at least as effective as."

F. Comments

Reported as of 11/4/05

BMP 06: High-Efficiency Washing Machine Rebate Programs

Reporting Unit:

City of San Jose

BMP Form Status:

100% Complete

Year:

2001

A. Implementation

1. Do any energy service providers or waste water utilities in your service area offer rebates for high-efficiency washers? yes

a. If YES, describe the offerings and incentives as well as who the energy/waste water utility provider is.

Santa Clara Valley Water District - \$100 rebate on Energy Star rated high-efficiency clothes washers (The City of San Jose contributes \$50 to each rebate distributed under this program to residents in San Jose, Santa Clara, Milpitas, Campbell, Cupertino, Saratoga, Monte Soreno, and Los Gatos).

2. Does your agency offer rebates for high-efficiency washers? yes

3. What is the level of the rebate? 100

4. Number of rebates awarded. 263

B. Rebate Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	14000	10500
2. Actual Expenditures	13150	

C. "At Least As Effective As"

1. Is your AGENCY implementing an "at least as effective as" variant of this BMP? no

a. If YES, please explain in detail how your implementation of this BMP differs from Exhibit 1 and why you consider it to be "at least as effective as."

D. Comments

Through the San Jose/Santa Clara Water Pollution Control Plant's wastewater flow reduction activities, the City of San Jose financially supports the high-efficiency washing machine rebate program conducted by the SCVWD. The expenditure figures above represent the SJMWS's 7% portion of the City's Water Pollution Control Plant's Service Area (PSA: San Jose, Santa Clara, Milpitas, Saratoga, Monte Sereno, Los Gatos, Campbell, Cupertino and Saratoga) program. The exact breakdown of the City's contribution is not tracked separately for each of the PSA's water retailers.

Reported as of 11/4/05

BMP 07: Public Information Programs

Reporting Unit:

City of San Jose

BMP Form Status:

100% Complete

Year:

2001**A. Implementation**

1. Does your agency maintain an active public information program to promote and educate customers about water conservation? yes

a. If YES, describe the program and how it's organized.

A-1. a. The public outreach program of the Municipal Water System is part of the overall outreach campaign conducted by the City of San Jose for the nine cities that discharge to the San Jose/Santa Clara Water Pollution Control Plant (WPCP). The outreach is designed to encourage indoor water savings during the Dry Weather Season of May through October. It utilizes print and broadcast advertising, water bill inserts, postcards, school tours of the WPCP and participation in special events. The budget numbers reflect the percentage of the total campaign budget represented by the Municipal Water System's service area, not the total budget. The number below states how many advertisements were produced, not how many times they aired on local media.

2. Indicate which and how many of the following activities are included in your public information program.

Public Information Program Activity	Yes/No	Number of Events
a. Paid Advertising	yes	7
b. Public Service Announcement	no	0
c. Bill Inserts / Newsletters / Brochures	yes	9
d. Bill showing water usage in comparison to previous year's usage	yes	
e. Demonstration Gardens	yes	1
f. Special Events, Media Events	yes	13
g. Speaker's Bureau	no	0
h. Program to coordinate with other government agencies, industry and public interest groups and media	yes	

B. Conservation Information Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	25011	24290
2. Actual Expenditures	10989	

C. "At Least As Effective As"

1. Is your AGENCY implementing an "at least as effective as" variant of this BMP? No

a. If YES, please explain in detail how your implementation of this BMP differs from Exhibit 1 and why you consider it to be "at least as effective as."

D. Comments

Reported as of 11/4/05

BMP 08: School Education Programs

Reporting Unit:

BMP Form Status:

Year:

City of San Jose**100% Complete****2001****A. Implementation**

1. Has your agency implemented a school information program to promote water conservation? yes

2. Please provide information on your school programs (by grade level):

Grade	Are grade-appropriate materials distributed?	No. of class presentations	No. of students reached	No. of teachers' workshops
Grades K-3rd	yes	21	977	1
Grades 4th-6th	yes	17	6426	4
Grades 7th-8th	yes	1	398	1
High School	yes	23	1137	2

3. Did your Agency's materials meet state education framework requirements? no

4. When did your Agency begin implementing this program? 1/1/1994

B. School Education Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	193850	167720
2. Actual Expenditures	193850	

C. "At Least As Effective As"

1. Is your AGENCY implementing an "at least as effective as" variant of this BMP? No

a. If YES, please explain in detail how your implementation of this BMP differs from Exhibit 1 and why you consider it to be "at least as effective as."

D. Comments

The above information represents the school education program for the entire City of San Jose, including the Municipal Water Service Area. In addition, 23 presentations reaching 1137 students and 2 teacher workshops were given to unknown grades, but are not accounted for above.

Reported as of 11/4/05

BMP 09: Conservation Programs for CII Accounts

Reporting Unit:
City of San Jose

BMP Form Status:
100% Complete

Year:
2001

A. Implementation

1. Has your agency identified and ranked COMMERCIAL customers according to use?no
2. Has your agency identified and ranked INDUSTRIAL customers according to use?no
3. Has your agency identified and ranked INSTITUTIONAL customers according to use?no

Option A: CII Water Use Survey and Customer Incentives Program

4. Is your agency operating a CII water use survey and customer incentives program for the purpose of complying with BMP 9 under this option?no

CII Surveys	Commercial Accounts	Industrial Accounts	Institutional Accounts
a. Number of New Surveys Offered			
b. Number of New Surveys Completed			
c. Number of Site Follow-ups of Previous Surveys (within 1 yr)			
d. Number of Phone Follow-ups of Previous Surveys (within 1 yr)			
CII Survey Components	Commercial Accounts	Industrial Accounts	Institutional Accounts
e. Site Visit			
f. Evaluation of all water-using apparatus and processes			
g. Customer report identifying recommended efficiency measures, paybacks and agency incentives			
Agency CII Customer Incentives	Budget (\$/Year)	No. Awarded to Customers	Total \$ Amount Awarded
h. Rebates			
i. Loans			
j. Grants			
k. Others			

Option B: CII Conservation Program Targets

5. Does your agency track CII program interventions and water savings for the purpose of complying with BMP 9 under this option?	yes
6. Does your agency document and maintain records on how savings were realized and the method of calculation for estimated savings?	yes
7. Estimated annual savings (AF/yr) from site-verified actions taken by agency since 1991.	18.5
8. Estimated annual savings (AF/yr) from non-site-verified actions taken by agency since 1991.	0

B. Conservation Program Expenditures for CII Accounts

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	14000	14000
2. Actual Expenditures	0	

C. "At Least As Effective As"

- | | |
|---|----|
| 1. Is your AGENCY implementing an "at least as effective as" variant of this BMP? | No |
|---|----|
- a. If YES, please explain in detail how your implementation of this BMP differs from Exhibit 1 and why you consider it to be "at least as effective as."

D. Comments

Reported as of 11/4/05

BMP 09a: CII ULFT Water Savings

Reporting Unit: **City of San Jose** BMP Form Status: **100% Complete** Year: **2001**

1. Did your agency implement a CII ULFT replacement program in the reporting year? Yes
 If No, please explain why on Line B.
 10.

A. Targeting and Marketing

1. What basis does your agency use to target customers for participation in this program? Check all that apply. CII Sector or subsector
CII ULFT Study subsector targeting

a. Describe which method you found to be the most effective overall, and which was the most effective per dollar expended.

Marketing to subsectors with potential water savings of 28gpd or higher.

2. How does your agency advertise this program? Direct letter
Web page
Telemarketing
 Check all that apply.

a. Describe which method you found to be the most effective overall, and which was the most effective per dollar expended.

Direct letters with follow-up telephone calls.

B. Implementation

1. Does your agency keep and maintain customer participant information? (Read the Help information for a complete list of all the information for this BMP.) Yes
2. Would your agency be willing to share this information if the CUWCC did a study to evaluate the program on behalf of your agency? Yes
3. What is the total number of customer accounts participating in the program during the last year ? 11

CII Subsector	Number of Toilets Replaced					Type Not Specified
	Standard Gravity Tank	Air Assisted	Valve Floor Mount	Valve Wall Mount		
4.						
a. Offices	0	0	0	0	0	0
b. Retail / Wholesale	0	8	0	0	0	0

c. Hotels	0	0	0	0	0
d. Health	0	0	0	0	0
e. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0
f. Schools: K to 12	0	0	0	0	0
g. Eating	0	0	0	0	0
h. Govern- ment	0	0	0	0	0
i. Churches	8	0	0	0	0
j. Other	0	0	0	0	0

5. Program
design.

Rebate or voucher
Direct installation

6. Does your agency use outside services to
implement this program? Yes

a. If yes, check all that
apply.

Consultant
Plumbing contractors/subcontracts

7. Participant tracking and
follow-up.

Site Visit

8. Based on your program experience, please rank on a scale of
1 to 5, with 1 being the least frequent cause and 5 being the most
frequent cause, the following reasons why customers refused to
participate in the program.

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| a. Disruption to business | 5 |
| b. Inadequate payback | 1 |
| c. Inadequate ULFT performance | 2 |
| d. Lack of funding | 3 |
| e. American's with Disabilities Act | 1 |
| f. Permitting | 4 |
| g. Other. Please describe in B. 9. | 1 |

9. Please describe general program acceptance/resistance by
customers, obstacles to implementation, and other issues affecting
program implementation or effectiveness.

Lack of installation service with the voucher program
reduces participation.

10. Please provide a general assessment of the program for this
reporting year. Did your program achieve its objectives? Were
your targeting and marketing approaches effective? Were
program costs in line with expectations and budgeting?

CII Voucher Program (City of San Jose) This
program did not achieve its objectives for the
2000-2001 Fiscal Year. Out of a goal of 500 for the
entire tributary service area, 175 were installed. The
San Jose Municipal Water System service area was
not specifically targeted, but 50 ULFTs were installed
there; 48 in a Motel and 2 in a restaurant. The
program was not actively marketed. Program costs

were below budget expectations. The Santa Clara Valley Water District financially supported this program. CII Full Service Installation Program (Santa Clara Valley Water District-administered program). This program did not achieve its objectives for the 2000-2001 Fiscal Year. Out of a goal of 750 for the entire tributary service area, 460 were installed. The San Jose Municipal Water System service area was not specifically targeted, but 19 ULFTs were installed there; 11 in restaurants and 8 in foodstores. The program was marketed primarily through its contractor and a postcard mailer. Program costs were below budget expectations. The City of San Jose financially supported this program at a level of \$115 per ULFT installed, as well as associated permit fees within the City of San Jose

C. Conservation Program Expenditures for CII ULFT

1. CII ULFT Program: Annual Budget & Expenditure Data

	Budgeted	Actual Expenditure
a. Labor	0	0
b. Materials	0	0
c. Marketing & Advertising	0	0
d. Administration & Overhead	0	0
e. Outside Services	11288	5081
f. Total	11288	5081

2. CII ULFT Program: Annual Cost Sharing

a. Wholesale agency contribution	7614
b. State agency contribution	0
c. Federal agency contribution	0
d. Other contribution	0
e. Total	7614

D. Comments

The budget and expenditure figures above represent the SJMWS's 7% portion of the City's trib-wide (San Jose, Santa Clara, Milpitas, Saratoga, Monte Sereno, Los Gatos, Campbell, Cupertino and Saratoga) program. The exact breakdown of the City's spending is not tracked separately for each of the tributary water retailers.

Reported as of 11/4/05

BMP 11: Conservation Pricing

Reporting Unit:

BMP Form Status:

Year:

City of San Jose**100% Complete****2001****A. Implementation****Rate Structure Data Volumetric Rates for Water Service by Customer Class****1. Residential**

a. Water Rate Structure	Increasing Block
b. Sewer Rate Structure	Service Not Provided
c. Total Revenue from Volumetric Rates	\$9022826
d. Total Revenue from Non-Volumetric Charges, Fees and other Revenue Sources	\$0

2. Commercial

a. Water Rate Structure	Uniform
b. Sewer Rate Structure	Service Not Provided
c. Total Revenue from Volumetric Rates	\$922296
d. Total Revenue from Non-Volumetric Charges, Fees and other Revenue Sources	\$0

3. Industrial

a. Water Rate Structure	Uniform
b. Sewer Rate Structure	Service Not Provided
c. Total Revenue from Volumetric Rates	\$1625826
d. Total Revenue from Non-Volumetric Charges, Fees and other Revenue Sources	\$0

4. Institutional / Government

a. Water Rate Structure	Uniform
b. Sewer Rate Structure	Service Not Provided
c. Total Revenue from Volumetric Rates	\$331668
d. Total Revenue from Non-Volumetric Charges, Fees and other Revenue Sources	\$0

5. Irrigation

a. Water Rate Structure	Uniform
b. Sewer Rate Structure	Service Not Provided
c. Total Revenue from Volumetric Rates	\$2855120

d. Total Revenue from
Non-Volumetric Charges, Fees \$0
and other Revenue Sources

6. Other

a. Water Rate Structure Uniform
b. Sewer Rate Structure Service Not Provided
c. Total Revenue from Volumetric Rates \$226140
d. Total Revenue from
Non-Volumetric Charges, Fees \$2427973
and other Revenue Sources

B. Conservation Pricing Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	0	0
2. Actual Expenditures	0	

C. "At Least As Effective As"

1. Is your AGENCY implementing an "at least as effective
as" variant of this BMP? No

a. If YES, please explain in detail how your implementation of this
BMP differs from Exhibit 1 and why you consider it to be "at least
as effective as."

D. Comments

Reported as of 11/4/05

BMP 12: Conservation Coordinator

Reporting Unit:

City of San Jose

BMP Form Status:

100% Complete

Year:

2001**A. Implementation**

1. Does your Agency have a conservation coordinator? yes
2. Is this a full-time position? yes
3. If no, is the coordinator supplied by another agency with which you cooperate in a regional conservation program ?
4. Partner agency's name:
5. If your agency supplies the conservation coordinator:
 - a. What percent is this conservation coordinator's position? 100%
 - b. Coordinator's Name Linden Skjeie
 - c. Coordinator's Title Supervising
Environmental Services
Specialist, Water
Efficiency Program
 - d. Coordinator's Experience and Number of Years Three
 - e. Date Coordinator's position was created (mm/dd/yyyy) 1/1/1989
6. Number of conservation staff, including Conservation Coordinator. 7

B. Conservation Staff Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	128000	107000
2. Actual Expenditures	36000	

C. "At Least As Effective As"

1. Is your AGENCY implementing an "at least as effective as" variant of this BMP? no
 - a. If YES, please explain in detail how your implementation of this BMP differs from Exhibit 1 and why you consider it to be "at least as effective as."

D. Comments

The water conservation coordinator and water conservation staff address the water conservation needs of the cities that discharge to the San Jose/Santa Clara Water Pollution Control Plant (San Jose, Santa Clara, Campbell, Milpitas, Monte Soreno, Saratoga and Los Gatos). The Municipal Water System comprises approximately 7% of this area. The budget figures above reflect that 7%. The City of San Jose has actually employed a Water Conservation Coordinator since 1984.

Reported as of 11/4/05

BMP 13: Water Waste Prohibition

Reporting Unit:

BMP Form Status:

Year:

City of San Jose**100% Complete****2001****A. Requirements for Documenting BMP Implementation**

1. Is a water waste prohibition ordinance in effect in your service area? yes

a. If YES, describe the ordinance:

The City of San Jose prohibits water waste through ordinances found in Title 15, Chapters 10 and 11 of the Municipal Code. The ordinances include the required use of recycled water where applicable, prohibition of water waste with specific definitions, and standing and emergency conservation measures.

2. Is a copy of the most current ordinance(s) on file with CUWCC? yes

a. List local jurisdictions in your service area in the first text box and water waste ordinance citations in each jurisdiction in the second text box:

City of San Jose

Water Conservation Program
Ordinances *15.10.200 " Water
waste prevention *15.10.210 "
Repair of plumbing, sprinkler
and irrigation systems
*15.10.220 " Water run-off
prohibited *15.10.255 "
Commercial car washes
*15.10.230 " Restaurants,
banquet facilities, hotels, and
dining facilities *15.10.240 "
Cleaning of structures and
surfaces *15.10.250 " Washing
of vehicles *15.10.260 "
Building and construction
*15.10.270 " Hydrants
*15.10.290 " Landscape
irrigation *15.10.295 " Use of
reclaimed water *15.10.400 "
Landscape irrigation audit
required *15.10.410 "
Certificate in lieu of landscape
irrigation audit *15.10.420 "
Format and filing of audits and
certificates *15.10.430 " Due
date for audits and certificates
*15.11.102 " Anti-drain valve or
valve check *15.11.104 "
Application rate (inches of
water applied per hour)
*15.11.108 " Automatic
controller (timer for watering
system) *15.10.110 " Backflow
prevention device *15.10.114 "

Emitter (drip irrigation fitting)
 *15.11.200 " Applicability of requirements for new or rehabilitated landscaping
 *15.11.205 " Landscape documentation package
 *15.11.210 " Water conservation concept statement *15.11.215 " Maximum applied water use
 *15.11.220 " Estimated applied water use *15.11.225 " Estimated total water use
 *15.11.235 " Landscape design " Plant selection and grouping
 *15.11.240 " Landscape design " Water features *15.11.250 " Irrigation design criteria
 *15.11.255 " Irrigation equipment *15.11.260 " Landscape irrigation systems
 *15.11.265 " Irrigation schedules *15.11.270 " Maintenance schedules
 *15.11.275 " Certification *15.11.280 " Model homes
 Emergency Conservation (Drought) Measures 10% or greater water shortage
 *15.10.310 " Landscape irrigation restrictions 20% or greater water shortage
 *15.10.320 " Restaurants
 *15.10.325 " Hotels, motels, and other lodgings *15.10.330 " Public restrooms *15.10.340 " Cleaning of structures and surfaces *15.10.350 " Operation of decorative fountains 30% or greater water shortage *15.10.310 " Landscape irrigation restrictions *15.10.360 " New landscape installation
 *15.10.365 " Hydrants 40% or greater water shortage
 *15.10.370 " Prohibition on landscape irrigation *15.10.375 " Filling pools, spas, and fountains *15.10.380 " Exception requests for use of potable water

B. Implementation

1. Indicate which of the water uses listed below are prohibited by your agency or service area.

a. Gutter flooding	yes
--------------------	-----

- | | |
|--|-----|
| b. Single-pass cooling systems for new connections | no |
| c. Non-recirculating systems in all new conveyor or car wash systems | yes |
| d. Non-recirculating systems in all new commercial laundry systems | no |
| e. Non-recirculating systems in all new decorative fountains | yes |
| f. Other, please name building, construction, hydrants, landscape irrigation | yes |

2. Describe measures that prohibit water uses listed above:

Prohibits the use of potable water for building and construction; Limits use of flushing fire hydrants; Designates time period for irrigation and provision for landscape audit; Calls for use of reclaimed water where available.

Water Softeners:

3. Indicate which of the following measures your agency has supported in developing state law:

- | | |
|--|----|
| a. Allow the sale of more efficient, demand-initiated regenerating DIR models. | no |
| b. Develop minimum appliance efficiency standards that: | |
| i.) Increase the regeneration efficiency standard to at least 3,350 grains of hardness removed per pound of common salt used. | no |
| ii.) Implement an identified maximum number of gallons discharged per gallon of soft water produced. | no |
| c. Allow local agencies, including municipalities and special districts, to set more stringent standards and/or to ban on-site regeneration of water softeners if it is demonstrated and found by the agency governing board that there is an adverse effect on the reclaimed water or groundwater supply. | no |
| 4. Does your agency include water softener checks in home water audit programs? | no |
| 5. Does your agency include information about DIR and exchange-type water softeners in educational efforts to encourage replacement of less efficient timer models? | no |

C. Water Waste Prohibition Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	0	0
2. Actual Expenditures	0	

D. "At Least As Effective As"

- | | |
|--|----|
| 1. Is your AGENCY implementing an "at least as effective as" variant of this BMP? | no |
| a. If YES, please explain in detail how your implementation of this BMP differs from Exhibit 1 and why you consider it to be "at least as effective as." | |

E. Comments

Reported as of 11/4/05

BMP 14: Residential ULFT Replacement Programs

Reporting Unit:

BMP Form Status:

Year:

City of San Jose**100% Complete****2001****A. Implementation**

	Single-Family Accounts	Multi-Family Units
1. Does your Agency have program(s) for replacing high-water-using toilets with ultra-low flush toilets?	yes	yes
Number of Toilets Replaced by Agency Program During Report Year		
Replacement Method	SF Accounts	MF Units
2. Rebate	0	0
3. Direct Install	600	159
4. CBO Distribution	78	2
5. Other	0	48
Total	678	209

6. Describe your agency's ULFT program for single-family residences.

The direct install program had two elements. The Community Partnership Program (CPP) provided free installation and was targeted low-income, elderly, and disabled residents who are unlikely to retrofit on their own. A Fee-For-Service program was available to those who did not qualify for CPP and offered the same service for a co-payment of \$50 per retrofit. A Distribution program was also available, providing free ULFTs and recycling of replaced toilets.

7. Describe your agency's ULFT program for multi-family residences.

Vouchers up \$75 per ULFT were available to those who began the voucher process before the sign-up period ended and is listed as "Other" above. A direct install program began in place of the voucher program. Direct installation for MFDs was available for a \$15 co-pay. In addition, a distribution program was available to MFDs.

8. Is a toilet retrofit on resale ordinance in effect for your service area? no

9. List local jurisdictions in your service area in the left box and ordinance citations in each jurisdiction in the right box:

City of San Jose

N/A

B. Residential ULFT Program Expenditures

	This Year	Next Year
1. Budgeted Expenditures	246691	257775
2. Actual Expenditures	88839	

C. "At Least As Effective As"

1. Is your AGENCY implementing an "at least as effective
as" variant of this BMP? no

a. If YES, please explain in detail how your implementation of this
BMP differs from Exhibit 1 and why you consider it to be "at least as
effective as."

D. Comments